DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 233 520 EC 160 041

AUTHOR Rawlings, Brenda W.
TITLE Louisiana Statewide Assessment and Data Management System for Hearing Impaired, Visually Impaired, and Deaf-Blind Students. Final Report, 1981-82.
INSTITUTION Gallaudet Research Inst., Washington, DC. Center for Assessment and Demographic Studies.; Louisiana State Dept. of Education, Baton Rouge.
PUB DATE Sep 82
NOTE 57p.; Some charts may reproduce poorly.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Tests; *Demography; Elementary Secondary Education; *Hearing Impairments; *State Surveys; *Student Characteristics; *Visual Impairments
IDENTIFIERS *Louisiana

ABSTRACT

The report describes Louisiana's effort to survey local education agencies and special schools for information on sensory impaired students (preschool through secondary levels) within the state. Information on demographic factors, educational program descriptions, hearing and vision status, and other educationally significant handicaps was obtained through analysis of individual student profiles. Further, performance of hearing impaired students on the Stanford Achievement Test for Hearing Impaired students (SAT-HI) was analyzed. Methods for obtaining and analyzing information are reviewed. Among data highlights cited are that state schools for the deaf and visually handicapped accounted for approximately 44% of the total population reported; males were predominant in number in all categories of handicap; and two-thirds of students with visual handicaps only were served in self-contained classes. Uses of the data management system include: generating individual student profiles, SAT-HI reports, and verification of subgroups within the sensory impaired population. A major achievement in this year's survey is explained to be the inclusion of the visually handicapped population. Among appendixes are pupil profile forms and detailed tables depicting student distribution. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED233520

1981-82 FINAL REPORT

LOUSIANA STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT AND DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR HEARING IMPAIRED, VISUALLY IMPAIRED, AND DEAF-BLIND STUDENTS

Brenda W. Rawlings

September 1982

Center for Assessment and Demographic Studies
Research Institute
Gallaudet College
Washington, D.C. 20002

EC160041

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Arthur N. Schildroth
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Louisiana Department of Education

J. Kelly Nix, Superintendent
Patrick Cooper, Ph.D., Assistant Superintendent
Office of Special Educational Services
Virginia Williams, Section Chief, Sensorially Impaired/Communicatively Disordered
Billie Levy, Coordinator of Programs for Visually Impaired
Harvey Corson, Ed.D., Superintendent, Louisiana School for the Deaf
Richard Day, Ed.D. Superintendent, Louisiana School for the Visually Impaired

Gallaudet College Administration

Edward C. Merrill, Jr., Ph.D., President
Doin Hicks, Ph.D., Vice-President, Division of Research
Raymond J. Trybus, Ph.D., Dean of the Research Institute

Center for Assessment and Demographic Studies Project Staff
for the Louisiana Statewide Assessment and Data Management System

Michael A. Karchmer, Ph.D., Project Director
Brenda Rawlings, Project Coordinator
Kathleen Berault, Research Technician
Susan Jablonski, Coordinator of Data Processing
John Woo, Senior Programmer
Thomas Allen, Senior Research Associate
Dorothea Bateman, Data Processing Supervisor
Blanche Williams, Data Processing Specialist
Sharon Johnson, Data Processing Specialist
Sally O'Rourke, Administrative Assistant
Hank Young, Research Technician

1981-82 FINAL REPORT
LOUSIANA STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT AND DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
FOR HEARING IMPAIRED, VISUALLY IMPAIRED, AND DEAF-BLIND PERSONS

INTRODUCTION

Since 1978 Gallaudet College's Center for Assessment and Demographic Studies (CADS), previously the Office of Demographic Studies, has undertaken on contract with the Louisiana State Department of Education to design and implement a system for the collection, retrieval, and analysis of educationally salient data on all hearing impaired and deaf-blind children and youth (0-21) who were receiving special educational services in Louisiana. During the 1981-82 school year, the scope of this project was expanded to include all visually handicapped children. The project has included two major components: 1) the collection of pupil profile information and 2) the statewide assessment of academic achievement performance of hearing impaired students using the Special Edition for Hearing Impaired Students of the Stanford Achievement Test.

Over the four academic years that the system has been in operation, there has been increasingly close collaboration between the CADS staff and personnel at the Office of Special Educational Services, at the Louisiana School for the Deaf, the Louisiana School for the Visually Handicapped, and with special educators from across the state. As a result of this combined effort, an extensive data base on over 2,000 sensorially impaired Louisiana

students has been established and utilized for educational planning, for research, and for management purposes; specially tailored reports for local and state use have been prepared as well as a nationally distributed publication on the project.

Perhaps the most important feature of the 1981-82 project was the expansion of the data management system to include children with a visual impairment. During the previous years only the hearing impaired and deaf-blind children had been in the target population. The inclusion of these children provides a much more complete picture of the sensory impaired population in the state and a more comprehensive data managment base to be used in program planning.

This report will describe the methodology used in collecting the information, summarize the activities which were undertaken by CADS and the LDE staff, and highlight some of the findings for the 1981-82 school year. Also presented will be a review of the various project reports prepared for the personnel at the LDE in Baton Rouge and for the administrative staff and teachers at the educational programs which participated in the project.

METHODOLOGY

Information was sought on all children and youth who had a sensory impairment and were attending an educational program in Louisiana at the pre-school through secondary level of instruction. The sensory impaired population included individuals with hearing impairments and/or visual impairments.

The information sought on these handicapped children included significant items relating to the provision of educational services. The major variables identified were:

a. child's demographic characteristics including name, residence, sex, birthdate, and race;

b. educational program descriptors;

c. hearing status;

d. vision status;

e. other educationally significant handicaps.

The instrument used for data collection is found in Appendix 1.

The strategy used for identifying this sensory impaired population was to contact all educational programs identified by the LDE and to ask them to complete a pupil profile form on each sensory impaired child they were serving. The programs identified included all parish school systems, and special educational facilities such as the Louisiana School for the Deaf and the Louisiana School for the Visually Handicapped. Additional special schools within the state serving other types of handicapped children were also included in the project so as to reach any multi-handicapped sensory impaired child.

If programs had participated in the Data Management System during the 1980-81 school year, they received a partially computer-completed form on the students reported that year and were only required to update this previously reported information; there were several new questions on the form which needed to be completed for all children. (If a child reported last year was no longer at the program, the respondent simply needed to indicate this and return the form.) For all new students, a complete pupil profile form needed to be returned to the survey office.

All of the demographic information was returned to the CADS office where the data were processed into a computerized data bank. A number of verification and editing procedures were included in the processing to assure a high degree of accuracy in the data file.

To meet the second objective of the project, the collection and analysis of assessment information on the hearing impaired population, test materials for the Stanford Achievement Test for Hearing Impaired Students (SAT-HI) were distributed to programs wishing to test their students. The completed answer documents were returned to CADS for scoring and analysis.

In this as in all CADS projects, utmost attention is given to the protection of the confidentiality of its sources in all phases of data collection, analysis, and utilization. The procedures employed ensure that no information can be released that would permit identification of an individual student or program, except to authorized persons. All the respondents are notified

of this underlying principle in correspondence, and a confidentiality statement appears on each pupil profile form. The CADS staff involved in the data processing have signed oaths of confidentiality and, throughout the project, additional safeguards are used to limit access to the computerized data files to authorized individuals only.

PROJECT ACTVITIES

In all steps of the project activities there was close cooperation between the staff at the Office of Special Educational Services (OSES) at the State Department of Education, the personnel at the various educational programs, and the staff at CADS. The activities described below utilized the skills and knowledge of individuals at all levels of educational program planning within the state.

Input on the design of the pupil profile form (Appendix 1) was received from the staff at the OSES as well as from administrators of schools. The information requested on each pupil was determined to be important for educational planning purposes; each item was also determined to be readily available to the respondents for ease of answering. The feature of partially completed records of previously preported students was incorporated to reduce the amount of time needed by respondents to complete the records. The form was printed in a format which could be optically scanned to reduce the data processing time.

The Assistant Superintendent of Special Education for the state and the Section Chief for the Sensorially Impaired contacted all supervisors of special education across the state and encouraged them to participate in the data management system. The programs also were reminded about the expansion of the project to include all visually handicapped children and the importance of reporting this additional segment of the population.

Each supervisor was requested to select an individual to serve as the survey coordinator and these names were then forwarded to CADS where they were processed into a computerized mailing list.

In December, all the survey coordinators were contacted and reminded about the academic assessment aspects of the project. A packet of informational materials were distributed which outlined the steps to be followed in testing all age-eligible hearing impaired children with the Stanford Achievement Test for Hearing Impaired Students (SAT-HI).

As orders for screening tests, practice tests, full batteries, and directions for administration were received, these materials were distributed to the programs. All the materials were provided free-of-charge to the participating programs under the terms of the contract.

In January, all programs were contacted regarding the completion of the pupil profile forms. Those programs not previously participating were asked to indicate if they served any sensory impaired children and if they responded positively, they were sent a supply of forms to be completed (Appendix 2). All programs participating last year were sent the records for updating the information on their previously reported students and a supply of blank forms to be completed on all visually handicapped children and any new hearing impaired and deaf-blind students. Programs needing additional pupil profile forms were shipped a supply as the requests were received.

The pupil profile forms were to be returned to CADS by March 1. All programs not heard from by that date received repeated follow-up contacts via phone and correspondence to attempt to obtain records on their sensory impaired children.

As the information was returned to CADS, the responses were processed utilizing Gallaudet College's Digital Equipment Corporation DEC-System 1080/KL-10 time-sharing computer. Most of the information on the forms was optically scanned using a Sentry 7001; data such as names and other "write-in" information which could not be processed in this manner were entered onto the computerized data base through CRT terminals utilizing key-to-disk processing. All the computer programs necessary for this data processing and analysis were developed by the CADS programming staff.

The completed SAT-HI answer documents began arriving at CADS for processing in mid-March. Four scoring dates were offered to the programs to allow them to schedule testing which would be match their school calendars. There were two scoring dates in March and two in April. As the answer documents were received by CADS they were edited for potential machine reading errors and then a student identification number was assigned to each document to permit later matching with the demographic information submitted on the pupil profile form. The tests were then sent to the Psychological Corporation for machine scoring. When the results were returned to CADS, individual Student Score Reports were prepared and sent to the respective participating programs. A sample Student Score Report is found in Appendix 3.

Meetings were held with the staff at the OSES during the year to monitor the status of the project and to coordinate activities. The uses of the data management system and data analysis needs were also highlighted in discussions at all stages of the project to assure that the needs of educational planners were addressed.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE DATA

The data gathered through the Louisiana State Assessment and Data Management Systen have been analyzed in a variety of ways and disseminated to educational personnel at various levels of the service delivery system. These reports are summarized in a later section of this document. Presented here is a brief overview of the findings.

A total of 91 parish school systems and special education facilities were contacted to participate in the project. Two-thirds of those contacted submitted student profiles on their sensory impaired population. There were ten programs that indicated they either did not have any sensory impaired children or children they did have were referred to another parish for service. There were 24 programs which either did not respond at all to the project or indicated they were not able to participate (Table 1).

A careful review of the 24 programs that did not participate suggests that they may not have responded for any of several reasons. First, when the initial contact list of programs was established, a number or organizations were included although it was not definitely known whether they had a program for sensorially impaired children or not. It was felt important, however, to include these programs in an attempt to reach as large a population as possible. Some of those contacted were speech and hearing centers which did not report their clients because they knew that student profiles were being submitted by the appropriate

parish or educational program. A number of the programs contacted had indicated in past years that they did not have any hearing impaired or deaf-blind children and therefore may have not responded this year as they still did not serve this segment of the population. There were other programs with sensory impaired children who simply chose not to submit information.

As best as can be estimated, the actual sensory impaired enrollment at these non-participating programs was quite small and may have been about 30 students. Additional follow-up attempts will be made with these programs during the 1982-83 school year to encourage their participation in the data management system.

TABLE 1: PROGRAM PARTICIPATION IN THE 1981-82 LOUISIANA STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT PROJECT

	Number
Programs Contacted	91
Programs submitting student profiles	57
Programs reporting they had no sensory impaired children	10
Programs not responding or not able to participate	24

As already mentioned, the collection of academic assessment information on the hearing impaired population is a major component of the management system. During the past academic year, 24 parishes and special schools chose to administer the Stanford Achievement Test for Hearing Impaired Students (SAT-HI). The test, designed for children 8 years of age or older, was given to approximately 800 hearing impaired children in Louisiana. These numbers reflect the programs which ordered SAT-HI materials and submitted them to CADS for machine scoring; there were a few additional programs which ordered materials and then hand scored them but these measures are not then part of the data management system although the programs may have been able to use the student data for their individual assessment activities. The individual school reports and the SAT-HI School Summary reports resulting from this aspect of the project are found in Appendices 3 and 4.

Student profiles were returned for 2053 sensory impaired children. Seventy percent of the records were for children with hearing impairment as their only sensory impairment; 19% of the children were reported to have only visual impairments; and 9% were classified as having both visual and hearing handicaps. There were an additional 51 children who were reported to have a sensory impairment but whether the impairment was an auditory or a visual handicap was not specified. (In Table 2 and the discussion of the data that follows, most of the information will

be presented in terms of these three categories of children: hearing impaired only, visually handicapped only, and hearing and visually handicapped.)

TABLE 2: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SENSORY IMPAIRED CHILDREN IN LOUISIANA

Type of Impairment	Number	Percent
All Sensory Impaired	2053	100%
Hearing Impaired Only	1436	70%
Visually Handicapped Only	389	19%
Hearing & Visually Handicapped	177	9%
Sensory Impairment Not Specified	51	2%

Below are some additional highlights of the data. The detailed tables from which these observations are taken appear in Appendix 6. These points are not noted in any specific order of importance and the statements in no way exhaust the possible analysis of the data base; these statements serve only as points for discussion and for analysis.

-- The Louisiana School for the Deaf (730 students) and the Louisiana School for the Visually Handicapped (147 students) accounted for about 44% of the total population reported. [Table A]

-- Orleans (123 students) and East Baton Rouge (112 students) reported the largest number of sensory impaired children of the parish school programs. [Table A]

-- For all three categories of children, the largest percentage of children were in the age range 18 years of age and older. (20% for children with only hearing impairments, 20% for those with visual handicaps only, and 25% for those with both visual and hearing handicaps.) [Table B]

-- There were no children under three years of age reported to have visual handicaps only. [Table B]

-- For all categories of handicaps, males were predominant in number. [Table C]

-- Two-thirds of the children with hearing handicaps only had losses in the severe to profound range, while almost three-fourths of the children with both visual and hearing handicaps had audiological losses in this range. [Table N]

-- "Self-contained classroom" was the most frequently reported (41%) IEP placement decision for children with hearing impairments only. [Table G]

-- Two-thirds of children with visual handicaps only were in "self-contained classes." [Table G]

-- "Special schools" was the most frequently reported (46%) IEP placement for children with visual and hearing handicaps. [Table G]

-- 83% of the children reported to have a hearing handicap as their only sensory impairment were classified on their Individualized Evaluation as primarily "hearing impaired"; 6% were classified as primarily "multi-handicapped"; 5%, as "mentally retarded"; and 4%, as "handicapped infants." [Table E]

-- Similarly, 81% of children reported to have a visual impairment only were classified as primarily "visually handicapped" on their Individualized Evaluation; 9% were classified as primarily "multi-handicapped"; and 5%, as "mentally retarded." [Table E]

-- Among those with both a visual and a hearing handicap, 51% were classified as primarily "hearing impaired" on their Individualized Evaluation; 21%, as "mentally

retarded"; and 10%, as "deaf-blind." Only 2% were classified as primarily "visually handicapped." [Table E]

-- For children with either single sensory impairment, the most frequently reported additional handicapping conditions were "mild-moderate mental retardation" and "educationally handicapped-slow learner." Among the children with both visual and hearing handicaps, "severe-profound mental retardation" and "mild-moderate mental retardation" were the most frequently reported additional handicaps. [Table F]

-- Children with both a visual and a hearing handicap did not have as current audiometric examinations as children with hearing impairments only. (68% of the hearing impaired only group had been tested in 1980 or more recently as compared to 60% of those with both visual and hearing impairments.) [Table]

-- Similarly, 87% of those with visual impairments only had had visual examinations between 1980-82 as compared to 71% of those with both a hearing and a visual impairment. [Table O]

USES OF THE DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

As already mentioned, the data management system has been used for a variety of educational planning needs during the past academic year. Both the demographic and academic assessment information have been accessed and individuals at all levels of program administraton have been able to utilize the data base. Described below are some of the applications of the system.

Individual Student Profiles:

For each student reported to the data management system, an individual summary of the information submitted was prepared (Appendix 4). The student's identifying information (including name, home address, parents' names, and child's birthdate and sex) is shown; also indicated are educational program and the site of educational services. A summary of the educational services is noted followed by information on the child's hearing and/or visual handicap. These Individual Student Profiles were provided to the State Department of Education for their use in reviewing individual student cases; this summary format should be useful to them for updating their files and as an easy reference source of information.

SAT-HI Student Score Reports:

For those children who took the Stanford Achievement Test for Hearing Impaired Students, an individual score analysis was returned to the child's educational program (Appendix 3).

These score reports include student's name, school, birthdate, age at testing, the test date, and the test level taken. The main body of the report lists each of the subtests taken by the student and divides these subtests into the various item groupings which make up the subtest, e.g., math computation is broken down into "knowledge of primary facts," "addition and subtraction," "multiplication and division," "common fractions," and "other operational models." Thus, a teacher who wishes to learn how an individual student is doing, not just in math computation in general but in multiplication and division specifically, can go to that section of the score report for a breakdown of the student's achievement in that area.

Shown on the report are the total number of questions on the subtest and item groupings, the number the student answered correctly, the number answered incorrectly, the number left blank, and the percentage answered correctly.

A second set of columns pertained to the subtests only and not to the subgroupings within the subtests. These columns listed:

A. the <u>scaled score</u>, a special type of measurement result which permits analysis of a student's growth in a specific instructional area across battery levels and across years or different test administrations. Thus, if a teacher wishes to learn what kind of progress a student has made in math computation over a period of three years, an

examination of the scaled score in this area over the yearly testing should be of great assistance in determining this progress or its lack. On the Stanford, a scaled score of 132 is defined as the performance of an average (hearing) student in the second month of the third grade, and 182 represents the average performance of the median (hearing) student in the second month of the eighth grade. Each scaled score unit on the Stanford thus represents one theoretical academic month.

B. the grade equivalent score, which is a comparison of the student's score results on a particular subtest with hearing children who took the same level of the test. Although this grade equivalent score is familiar to most teachers and administrators, it should be used with great caution in regard to hearing impaired youngsters since it reflects a comparison not based on age but on test level taken.

C. the hearing impaired percentile rank, a comparison of the student's score results with hearing impaired students of the same age who took part in the national achievement test standardization program in 1974.

SAT-HI School Summary Reports:

Each program receives a summary of the SAT-HI results for their educational program. This report also provides data on the average scale scores for the entire state. The report categorizes the findings by age groups and also includes a summary of the demographic information on the students who were tested. The important demographic factors which might influence academic achievement and should be considered in analyzing the results include age, ethnicity, additional handicaps, and severity of hearing loss. These reports are a useful part of program evaluations.

Reporting Source Summaries:

These tabulations are prepared for each program submitting information to the data management system. The report summarizes the characteristics of the student population at the particular program and compares this information to that reported for the entire state. The information is categorized for the three subgroups of the population: those children with hearing handicaps only, those with visual handicaps only, and those with both hearing and visual impairments. Among the variables selected for comparison are sex, additional handicapping conditions, age at onset of sensory impairment, and cause of sensory impairment. Each participating program receives a copy of the information on their program and the OSES receives a complete set of these reports Both the educational programs and the OSES utilize these Reporting Source Summaries in program planning by being able to compare the

characteristics of a specific school population to that of the entire state. By recogizing similarities and differences in the enrollments, insights are gained which can affect planning decisions.

Summary of All Sensory Impaired Children:

A computer tabulation of all information submitted on the sensory impaired children in Louisiana was prepared and submitted to the Louisiana Department of Education. For each variable the responses provided were tabulated and the percentage distribution reported. This has proven useful for statewide planning purposes.

Analysis Reports by Major Categories of Sensory Impairment:

Similar in content to the statewide summary, these analysis reports show the data according to the three major classifications of handicap: children with hearing impairments only, children with visual handicaps only, and children with both hearing and visual handicaps. These breakdowns have been of interest to individuals in the State Office who have specific responsiblity for a particular category of handicapped population.

Tabulations of Special Populations:

Tables summarizing the information submitted on special populations have been prepared for OSES. These have highlighted the characteristics of students at the Louisiana School for the

Deaf and the Louisiana School for the Visually Handicapped. Also of interest has been the analysis of information on children enrolled in the Parent-Pupil Education Program.

Verification of Population:

During the year, the data management system has been accessed to attempt to verify certain subgroups within the sensory impaired population reported to the Louisiana Statewide Data Management System. In all cases, the confidentiality of the student information has been maintained. Comparisons of those Louisiana children on the Deaf-Blind Registry with those children reported to have a visual and hearing handicap in this data management system have been undertaken. These analyses have located some children reported to the Registry who are not in the Lousiana Data Management System and vice versa. Further analysis by SDE staff are presently underway with these data.

Analysis of data on hearing impaired children has been provided to assist in a follow-up project with the Kresge Hearing Research Laboratory of the South. They are attempting to determine the predictive abilities of auditory brain stem response tests. Recent audiograms are being examined to verify the existence of hearing impairment in children earlier diagnosed via auditory brain stem response tests.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This fourth year of the Lousiana Statewide Assessment and Data Management System met all of the objectives it set out to in the beginning of the academic year. There was close cooperation between the SDE staff, parish personnel, and the administrators of special schools in achieving the goals of the project. As with any project, however, there are several areas which might be strengthened or need to be highlighted during the 1982-83 project.

Efforts must be maintained to include those visually handicapped children who were not reported into the system this year. During the 1981-82 academic year, the initial steps were taken to include all visually handicapped children, but experience with similar projects by CADS has shown that during the intitnl year of trying to reach a specific population usually only a small segment of the population is reported. Through greater awareness of the project and increased efforts at identifying handicapped students by respondents, a more comprehensive data base will be achieved. CADS staff plan to work more closely during the 1982-83 academic year with those people at the state level with responsibility for visually handicapped children to increase the coverage of this group.

Additional efforts will be made to get information on those sensory impaired children at the special schools across the state. Not all of these programs have been able to participate

in the project in the past and yet the data management system needs to incorporate these special children who may have handicaps in addition to their sensory deficit.

The academic assessment which has been a keystone of the project will continue to receive strong emphasis during the 1982-83 academic year. The measures of academic achievement have been used at all levels of program planning, from the classroom teacher to the administrators at the state level. As in the past, the assessment information will be linked to the demographic data to permit appropriate analysis.

During this past year, special steps were taken to include all sensory impaired children enrolled in the Parent Pupil Education Program (PPEP). Duplicate records were obtained from the parish where the child resided and from the PPEP program administrators at the Louisiana School for the Deaf. This was done to be sure that the parish was aware of the young children in their parish who were receiving services from the PPEP. In past years not all parishes reported these children to the data management system. Efforts will continue in this area so that the parishes are well aware of these infants who may be enrolling in classroom programs over the next few years as they reach school age.

Following up on initial discussions held during the past year, the CADS staff recommend continued consultation with the staff of the Louisiana Network of Special Education Records (LANSER) project. Assisting in whatever way possible, the CADS

will augment the LANSER staff's efforts to assure that the projects are compatible and that the Louisiana Statewide Assessment and Data Management System does not duplicate the efforts of LANSER. LANSER staff have suggested that their initial data collection efforts might utilize the 1982-83 CADS data in a verification of the LANSER system and CADS will cooperate in any way that it can.

Aware of the possible termination of the National Deaf-Blind Registry, CADS should attempt to assure that all deaf-blind children in the state are included in the 1982-83 project. Should Registry data no longer be available to educational planners, CADS would work with these individuals to allow them to access the Louisiana Statewide Data Management System to obtain the information necessary for them to make their decisions.

The inclusion of the visually handicapped population, the continued coverage of the hearing impaired students, the emphasis on collection of academic assessment data, and the cooperation of the participants in this project have made the Louisiana Statewide Assessment and Data Management System finally begin to reach its full potential. The continuation of these activities should assure an improved and more comprehensive data base which will fill a wide range of planning needs.

APPENDICES

1. 1981-82 Pupil Profile Form
2. Program Response Form
3. Individual Student Score Report, Stanford Achievement Test for Hearing Impaired Students
4. Individual Student Profile
5. SAT-HI School Summary Report
6. Detailed Tables

LOUISIANA STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT AND DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR HEARING IMPAIRED, VISUALLY IMPAIRED AND DEAF-BLIND STUDENTS, 1981–82 SCHOOL YEAR

Division of Special Education Services
Louisiana State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Office of Demographic Studies
Gallaudet College
Washington, D.C. 20002

CONFIDENTIAL: All information which would permit identification of any individual or institution will be held strictly confidential and will be used only by Louisiana State Department of Education officials and O.D.S. staff for authorized purposes. The data will not be disclosed to others for any other reasons.

A. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

1. STUDENT NAME LAST FIRST

2. HOME ADDRESS STREET

CITY PARISH STATE ZIP CODE

3. PARENT OR GUARDIAN NAME

4. DATE OF BIRTH

PREVIOUS REPORTED DATE			

NEW OR CORRECTED			
MONTH	DAY		
○ JAN			
○ FEB			
○ MAR	⓪	⓪	⓪
○ APR	①	①	①
○ MAY	②	②	②
○ JUN	③	③	③
○ JUL		④	④
○ AUG		⑤	⑤
○ SEP		⑥	⑥
○ OCT		⑦	⑦
○ NOV		⑧	⑧
○ DEC		⑨	⑨

5. SEX

PREVIOUS	NEW OR CORRECTED
	○ MALE
	○ FEMALE

USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY

- ERASE CLEANLY.
- DO NOT USE INK OR FELT TIP PENS.
- MAKE NO STRAY MARKS.
- MARK AND WRITE IN DESIGNATED AREAS ONLY.

CORRECT MARKS ● ● ● ●
INCORRECT MARKS ◐ ◑ ⊗ ✓

EXAMPLE: WHAT IS STUDENT'S AGE?
13 (29) ① ② ● ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨

*B. PRESENT SCHOOL

If new student, write-in school name above.

Is student still enrolled in this school? (PLEASE MARK *ONLY ONE:* if new student, skip to item C.)

○ YES (If "YES", please complete remainder of this form.)

○ TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER SCHOOL WITHIN OUR PARISH SYSTEM OR DISTRICT BOUNDARIES (Complete remainder of this form.)

Name of school in your system to which this student transferred:

_____

○ NO (If "NO", there is no need to complete remainder of this form, but return it to Survey Office.)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

	⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨
	⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨
	⓪ ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨
	⓪ ① ②

29

*C. EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

(ANSWER ALL ITEMS 1 THROUGH 8.)

1. WHAT IS THIS CHILD'S CURRENT INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN (IEP) PLACEMENT DECISION? (MARK ONLY ONE.)

○ SELF CONTAINED
○ RESOURCE
○ ITINERANT
○ REGULAR ONLY
○ HOME PROGRAM
○ HABILITATION (IHP)
○ NO IEP OR IHP ON FILE

2. DOES THIS SENSORY IMPAIRED STUDENT RECEIVE *SPECIAL EDUCATION* CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION?

○ YES ○ NO (go to 3)

If "YES", this student receives this instruction in a setting designed for or with: (Mark all that apply.)

○ HEARING IMPAIRED STUDENTS ONLY
○ VISUALLY HANDICAPPED STUDENTS ONLY
○ DEAF/BLIND STUDENTS ONLY
○ MULTIPLY HANDICAPPED SENSORY IMPAIRED (but not Deaf/Blind)
○ STUDENTS WITH VARIOUS HANDICAPS, NOT ALL OF WHOM ARE SENSORY IMPAIRED
○ THIS STUDENT RECEIVES INSTRUCTION AT HOME

AND

According to the Individual Education Plan (IEP), indicate the related services provided on a regular basis to this child. (Mark all that apply.)

○ SPEECH THERAPY
○ SPEECH INSTRUCTION
○ AUDITORY TRAINING
○ OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY
○ PHYSICAL THERAPY
○ OTHER (specify) _____

3. DOES THIS STUDENT RECEIVE *REGULAR CLASSROOM* INSTRUCTION WITH NON-HANDICAPPED STUDENTS, EITHER FULL OR PART-TIME?

○ YES ○ NO (go to 4)

If "YES", indicate the *services* this student receives in support of this regular instruction.

○ (IF NONE MARK HERE)

○ INTERPRETER
○ NOTE-TAKER
○ TUTOR OR SPECIAL AIDE
○ READER
○ BRAILLE
○ LARGE PRINT
○ RECORDED MATERIALS
○ OTHER (specify) _____

SYSTEM FOR HEARING IMPAIRED, VISUALLY IMPAIRED AND DEAF-BLIND STUDENTS, 1981-82 SCHOOL YEAR

Bureau of Special Education Services
Louisiana State Department of Education
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Office of Demographic Studies
Gallaudet College
Washington, DC 20002

RESPONSE FORM

FORMS RECEIPT

Louisiana Survey forms have been received. We anticipate returning them to ODS by _____.

Please send ____ more survey forms.

Call 202/651-5300 collect if you wish.

Signed: _____

_____
(Position Title)

_____
(Area Code) (Phone Number)

TWO QUESTIONS

1. How many HEARING IMPAIRED students were enrolled in your school or program for the present 1981-82 school year (as of January 1, 1982)?

   1. _____
   Number of HI Students

2. The program for hearing impaired students printed on the label below is:

   ☐ Independent (e.g., state school for the deaf, private, or individually maintained)

   ☐ A school system itself (e.g., district, county, city, regional unit, cooperative, corporation, consortium, collaborative, BOCES, etc.)
   If this is checked, how many individual schools enrolling hearing impaired students are within your system? _____ (# of Students)

   ☐ Individual school or unit which is part of a larger school system (e.g., district, city, county, region, collaborative, etc.)
   Name of this larger system: _____

   ☐ Speech/hearing/language clinic or center (either by itself or as part of a larger unit, e.g., hospital, university, etc.)

   ☐ Facility, school, or unit for hearing impaired individuals who are multiply handicapped

   ☐ Other (please specify): _____

ADDRESS VERIFICATION

Please check and verify the information on the label below. Enter any changes on the appropriate lines at the right. Please do not remove or deface the label.

_____
(Name)

_____
(Title)

_____
(Program Name)

_____
(Address)

_____
(City) (State) (Zip)

THANK YOU!

Please return this form in the attached business reply envelope.

SAMPLE

OFFICE OF DEMOGRAPHIC STUDIES
STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST ANALYSIS

SAMPLE

EXAMINEE: NO ONE, John
TEST LEVEL: 3
SCHOOL: NO PLACE SCHOOL, NO PLACE, U.S.A.

BIRTHDATE: 6/6/66
TEST DATE: 3/3/78
AGE AT TESTING: 12

SUBTEST AREA Item Group Description	No. Of Items	Right	Wrong	Blank	Percent Right	Scale Score	Grade Equiv.	H.I. Rank
VOCABULARY	37	18	19	0	48	115	2.0	78
Reading and Literature	13	4	9	0	30			
Nonfiction and Reference	6	2	4	0	33			
Mathematics and Science	9	4	5	0	44			
Social Science	9	8	1	0	88			
READING COMPREHENSION	70	41	29	0	58	136	3.4	81
Global Meaning	6	4	2	0	66			
Explicit Meaning	19	6	13	0	31			
Implicit Meaning	19	13	6	0	68			
Meaning Determined by Context	13	10	3	0	76			
Inferential Meaning	13	8	5	0	61			
MATHEMATICS CONCEPTS	32	20	12	0	62	151	4.7	83
Numbers	8	4	4	0	50			
Notation	11	6	5	0	54			
Operations	8	5	3	0	62			
Geometry, Measurement, Etc.	5	5	0	0	100			
MATHEMATICS COMPUTATION	40	16	2	22	40	151	4.5	59
Knowledge of Primary Facts	18	6	1	11	33			
Addition and Subtraction	9	5	1	3	55			
Multiplication and Division	13	5	0	8	38			
MATHEMATICS APPLICATIONS	28	22	6	0	78	151	4.6	82
Solution of 1-step Problem	7	7	0	0	100			
Analysis and Solution Design	13	10	3	0	76			
Measurement	8	5	3	0	62			
LANGUAGE	55	1*	1	53	1	55	1.0	1
Capitals, Punctuation, Usage	38	0	0	38	0			
Word Sensitivity	11	1	0	10	9			
Recognizing Complete Sentences	6	0	1	5	0			

*This score is below what would be expected from pure guessing.

INDIVIDUAL DEMOGRAPHIC REPORT
LOUISIANA STATEWIDE ASSESSMENT
AND DATA MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
HEARING IMPAIRED, VISUALLY IMPAIRED & DEAF-BLIND STUDENTS
1981-1982 SCHOOL YEAR

19-329-501 (7000) ANYWHERE PARISH
NO PLACE SCHOOL

NAME:	NO ONE, John
HOME ADDRESS:	RT 2, ANYWHERE, LA.
PARENT OR GUARDIAN NAME:	Mrs. NO ONE
SEX:	MALE
DATE OF BIRTH:	10-23-66
IEP PLACEMENT DECISION:	RESOURCE
RECEIVED SPECIAL ED SERVICE?:	YES
SETTING FOR SPECIAL SERVICE:	STUDENTS W/VARIOUS HANDICAPS
IEP RELATED SERVICES:	SPEECH THERAPY
INTEGRATED W/NON-HCP?:	YES
HRS/WK ACADEMIC INTEGRATION:	16-25 HOURS
HRS/WK NON-ACAD INTEGRATION:	11-15 HOURS
PARENT/CHILD PROGRAM?:	NO
RESIDE AT SCHOOL?:	NO, RESIDES AT HOME
ETHNIC BACKGROUND:	WHITE
INDIV. EVAL. CLASSIFICATION:	HEARING IMPAIRED
IMPAIRMENTS/CONDITIONS:	HARD-OF-HEARING
STUDENT HEARING IMPAIRED?:	YES
AGE AT ONSET OF HEARING LOSS:	UNKNOWN
CAUSE OF HEARING LOSS:	DATA NOT AVAILABLE IN STUDENT'S RECORD
AUDIO. FINDING DATE EXAM:	01-82
HEARING LEVEL:	035 050 055 035 050 060
ESTIMATE:	MODERATE (41-55DB ISO)
CURRENTLY WEAR HEARING AID?:	YES
DIAGNOSED USHERS SYNDROME?:	NO
SIGN LANGUAGE USE:	NO
VISUAL IMPAIRMENT?:	YES
AGE AT ONSET OF VISION LOSS:	
CAUSE OF VISUAL IMPAIRMENT:	INJURY OR ACCIDENT

DATE TESTED:	09-81		
VISUAL ACUITY	DISTANCE	NEAR	
(O.D.):	DNR	DNR	-- PT - IN
(O.S.):	BLIND	BLIND	66 PT 6 IN
(O.U.):	DNR	DNR	-- PT - IN

FIELD OF VISION - RIGHT EYE:	NORMAL
LEFT EYE:	NOT REPORTED —
WEAR GLASSES?:	NO
LOW VISION EXAM -LAST 3 YRS?:	NO
READING MODES:	REGULAR PRINT

****
* CENTER OF ASSESSMENT AND DEMOGRAPHIC STUDIES *
* STANFORD ACHIEVEMENT TEST SCHOOL REPORT *
* FOR THE STATE OF LOUISIANA *
* 1981-1982 SCHOOL YEAR *
****

REPORTING SOURCE: ANYWHERE Parish

S.A.T. SCALED SCORE SUMMARY

	AGE GROUP									
	10 OR YOUNGER		11-13		14-16		17 OR OLDER		ALL AGES	
	N	AVE	N	AVE	N	AVE	N	AVE	N	AVE
READING COMPREHENSION										
SCHOOL:	16	134	15	135	7	147	7	156	45	140
STATE:	155	123	182	128	176	133	171	134	684	130
MATHEMATICS CONCEPTS										
SCHOOL:	21	129	16	136	8	160	7	171	52	141
STATE:	159	118	183	127	175	135	170	140	687	130
MATHEMATICS COMPUTATION										
SCHOOL:	19	142	16	150	8	171	7	182	50	155
STATE:	157	133	181	144	175	154	170	159	683	143

PLEASE NOTE:
INTERPRET WITH CAUTION WHEN THERE ARE SMALL NUMBERS OF STUDENTS IN A CATEGORY, BECAUSE AVERAGES MAY BE AFFECTED DISPROPORTIONATELY BY SCORES OF INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

DISTRIBUTIONS OF DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

	AGE GROUP				ALL AGES	
	10 OR YOUNGER	11-13	14-16	17 OR OLDER	N	%
HEARING LOSS						
SCHOOL:						
70DB OR LESS	11	11	4	3	29	55.8
71DB TO 90DB	4	5	2	1	12	23.1
91DB TO MORE	6	0	2	3	11	21.2
STATE:						
70DB OR LESS	47	48	46	33	174	25.6
71DB TO 90DB	34	44	36	51	165	24.2
91DB TO MORE	73	87	95	87	342	50.2
ETHNIC BACKGROUND						
SCHOOL:						
WHITE	15	9	4	5	33	63.5
BLACK	6	5	2	2	15	28.8
HISPANIC	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
OTHER/MULTI-ETH.	0	2	2	0	4	7.7
STATE:						
WHITE	111	103	101	95	410	59.3
BLACK	46	75	72	72	265	38.4
HISPANIC	2	2	1	2	7	1.0
OTHER/MULTI-ETH.	0	3	4	2	9	1.3
ADDITIONAL HANDICAPS						
SCHOOL:						
ONE OR MORE	11	9	5	3	28	53.8
NONE REPORTED	10	7	3	4	24	46.2
STATE:						
ONE OR MORE	66	62	59	59	246	35.5
NONE REPORTED	94	121	119	112	446	64.5

NOTE:

THESE DATA REFLECT ONLY THOSE STUDENTS WHO TOOK THE SAT-HI AND FOR WHOM DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION WAS REPORTED

TABLE A: NUMBER OF SENSORY IMPAIRED CHILDREN IN LOUISIANA BY REPORTING SOURCE, 1981-82

REPORTING SOURCE	TOTAL		HEARING IMPAIRED ONLY		VISUALLY HANDICAPPED ONLY		HEARING AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL STUDENTS	2002	100%	1436	100%	389	100%	177	100%
Louisiana School for the Deaf	730	36.4	640	44.6	--	---	90	50.9
Louisiana School for the Visually Handicapped	147	7.3	--	---	146	37.5	1	0.6
Ascension Parish	24	1.1	23	1.6	--	---	1	0.6
Avoyelles Parish	11	0.5	11	0.8	--	---	--	---
Beauregard Parish	3	0.1	3	0.2	--	---	--	---
Bienville Parish	3	0.1	1	0.1	2	0.5	--	---
Bogalusa City	3	0.1	3	0.2	--	---	--	---
Bossier Parish	9	0.4	4	0.3	4	1.0	1	0.6
Caddo Parish	104	5.1	71	4.9	28	7.2	5	2.8
Calcasieu	61	3.0	41	2.9	18	4.6	2	1.1
Catahoula	5	0.2	3	0.2	2	0.5	--	---
Claiborne	1	*	1	0.1	--	---	--	---
Concordia	7	0.3	7	0.5	--	---	--	---
Desoto	1	*	1	0.1	--	---	--	---
East Baton Rouge	112	5.5	85	5.9	26	6.7	1	0.6
East Carroll	6	0.2	1	0.1	5	1.3	--	---
East Feliciana	1	*	--	---	--	---	1	0.6
Franklin	4	0.1	--	---	4	1.0	--	---
Grant	2	*	--	---	2	0.5	--	---
Iberia	13	0.6	13	0.9	--	---	--	---
Iberville	7	0.3	7	0.5	--	---	--	---
Jackson	13	0.6	9	0.6	3	0.8	1	0.6
Jefferson	47	2.3	25	1.7	21	5.4	1	0.6
Lafayette	99	4.9	61	4.2	35	9.0	3	1.7
LaSalle	4	0.1	3	0.2	1	0.3	--	---
Lincoln	15	0.7	8	0.6	5	1.3	2	1.1
Livingston	4	0.1	2	0.1	2	0.5	--	---
Madison	2	*	--	---	2	0.5	--	---
Monroe	44	2.1	36	2.5	6	1.5	2	1.1
Morehouse	23	1.1	17	1.2	6	1.5	--	---
Orleans	123	6.1	89	6.2	25	6.4	9	5.1
Plaquemines	3	0.1	--	---	1	0.3	2	1.1

(Table A continues on the following page)

TABLE A (Continued)

REPORTING SOURCE	TOTAL		HEARING IMPAIRED ONLY		VISUALLY HANDICAPPED ONLY		HEARING AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Rapides	30	1.4	14	1.0	15	3.9	1	0.6
Red River	2	*	1	0.1	1	0.3	--	---
Richland	3	0.1	3	0.2	--	---	--	---
St. Bernard	5	0.2	5	0.3	--	---	--	---
St. Charles	20	0.9	15	1.0	3	0.8	2	1.1
St. Landry	14	0.6	11	0.8	--	---	3	1.7
St. Martin	10	0.4	9	0.6	1	0.3	--	---
St. Mary	18	0.8	17	1.2	--	---	1	0.6
St. Tammany	14	0.6	10	0.7	3	0.4	1	0.6
Tangipahoa	3	0.1	2	0.1	--	---	1	0.6
Tensas	1	*	--	---	1	0.3	--	---
Terrebonne	14	0.6	9	0.6	4	1.0	1	0.6
Union	2	*	1	0.1	1	0.3	--	---
Vernon	1	*	1	0.1	--	---	--	---
Washington	10	0.4	4	0.3	6	1.5	--	---
Webster	1	*	1	0.1	--	---	--	---
West Carroll	1	*	1	0.1	--	---	--	---
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	7	[illegible]	1	[illegible]	--	---
Chinchuba Institute for the Deaf	63	3.1	63	4.4	--	---	--	---
The Bright Preschool for Hearing Impaired	16	0.7	14	1.0	--	---	2	1.1
Northwestern State University Lab School	19	0.9	17	0.2	--	---	2	1.1
Pinecrest State School	39	1.9	12	0.8	--	---	27	5.3
Northwest State School	13	0.6	2	0.1	4	1.0	7	4.0
Danneel TMR Center	5	0.2	5	0.3	--	---	--	---
Belle Chase State School	57	2.8	47	3.3	3	0.8	7	4.0

* Less than 0.1%

TABLE B : NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SENSORY IMPAIRED CHILDREN BY AGE, 1981-82

AGE[a]	All Sensory Impaired		Hearing Impaired Only		Visually Handicapped Only		Hearing & Visually Impaired	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TOTAL Students[b]	1978	100.0	1422	100.0	381	100.0	175	100.0
Under 1 year	8	0.4	7	0.5	--	--	1	0.6
1 year	6	0.3	5	0.4	--	--	1	0.6
2 years	18	0.9	17	1.2	--	--	1	0.6
3 years	46	2.3	41	2.9	3	0.8	2	1.1
4 years	87	4.4	75	5.3	5	1.3	7	4.0
5 years	70	3.5	49	3.4	15	3.9	6	3.4
6 years	82	4.1	60	4.2	18	4.7	4	2.3
7 years	90	4.5	67	4.7	16	4.2	7	4.0
8 years	81	4.1	62	4.4	15	3.9	4	2.3
9 years	100	5.1	76	5.3	18	4.7	6	3.4
10 years	105	5.4	63	4.4	27	7.1	15	8.6
11 years	111	5.6	75	5.3	27	7.1	9	5.1
12 years	123	6.2	83	5.8	30	7.9	10	5.7
13 years	115	5.8	83	5.8	25	6.6	7	4.0
14 years	135	6.8	89	6.3	25	6.6	21	12.0
15 years	140	7.1	96	6.8	32	8.4	12	6.9
16 years	126	6.4	91	6.4	27	7.1	8	4.6
17 years	132	6.7	97	6.8	24	6.3	11	6.3
18 years	180	9.1	145	10.2	19	5.0	16	9.1
19 years & older	223	11.3	141	10.0	55	14.6	27	15.6

[a] Age as of December 31, 1981

[b] This excludes 14 children who are only hearing impaired, 8 who are only visually handicapped, and 2 who are both hearing and visually impaired for whom data were not reported.

TABLE C: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY SEX OF SENSORY IMPAIRED CHILDREN, 1981-82

Sex	Hearing Impaired Only	Visually Handicapped Only	Hearing & Visually Impaired
Both Sexes[a]	100%	100%	100%
Males	53%	62%	59%
Females	47%	38%	41%

[a] Excludes 2 children who are only hearing impaired and 2 who have both hearing and visual impairments for whom data were not reported.

TABLE D: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY ETHNIC ORIGIN OF SENSORY IMPAIRED CHILDREN IN LOUISIANA, 1981-82

ETHNIC ORIGIN	Hearing Impaired Only		Visually Handicapped Only		Hearing & Visually Impaired	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Students[a]	1431	100.0%	383	100.0%	176	100.0%
White only	796	55%	208	54%	106	60%
Black only	594	41%	168	44%	68	39%
Hispanic only	15	2%	1	0.2%	--	--
Oriental only	12	1%	2	0.5%	1	0.5%
American Indian only	3	0.2%	--	--	--	--
Other Ethnic	5	0.3%	1	0.2%	--	--
Multi-Ethnic	6	0.4%	3	1%	1	0.5%

[a] Excludes 5 children who are only hearing impaired, 6 who are only visually handicapped, and 1 child who has both visual and hearing impairments for whom data were not reported.

TABLE E: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIMARY HANDICAPPING CLASSIFICATION ON INDIVIDUALIZED EVALUATIONS, 1981-81

Primary Handicap on Evaluation	Hearing Impaired Only		Visually Handicapped Only		Hearing & Visually Impaired	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Students[a]	1394	100.0%	385	100.0%	175	100.0%
Autism	1	0.1%	--	--	--	--
Behavior Disorder	1	0.1%	--	--	--	--
Deaf/Blind	2	0.1%	2	0.5%	17	9.7%
Educationally Handicapped/Slow Learner	18	1.3%	6	1.6%	--	--
Gifted	4	0.3%	--	--	--	--
Handicapped Infant	51	3.7%	7	1.8%	2	1.1%
Hearing Impaired	1153	82.7%	--	--	89	50.9%
Learning Disabled	10	0.7%	4	1.0%	1	0.6%
Mentally Retarded	74	5.3%	19	4.9%	37	21.1%
Multi-Handicapped	77	5.5%	35	9.1%	25	14.3%
Orthopedically Handicapped	2	0.1%	2	0.5%	1	0.6%
Other Health Impaired	1	0.1%	--	--	--	--
Talented	--	--	--	--	--	--
Visually Handicapped	--	--	310	80.5%	3	1.7%

[a] Excludes 42 children who are only hearing impaired, 4 who are only visually handicapped, and 2 who have both hearing and visual impairments for whom data were not reported.

TABLE F: NUMBER AND PERCENTATGE DISTRIBUTION OF HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS AMONG SENSORY IMPAIRED CHILDREN IN LOUISIANA, 1981-82

HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS	HEARING IMPAIRED ONLY		VISUALLY HANDICAPPED ONLY		HEARING AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Students[a]	1251	*	374	*	157	*
Autism	5	0.4	--	--	2	1.3
Behavioral Disorder	11	0.9	2	0.5	3	1.9
Blind	--	--	144	38.5	14	8.9
Cerebral Palsy	31	2.5	10	2.7	3	1.9
Deaf	772	61.7	--	--	68	43.3
Deaf/Blind	5	0.4	1	0.3	44	28.0
Educationally Handicapped, Slow Learner	110	8.9	41	11.0	12	7.6
Emotionally Disturbed	6	0.5	--	--	1	0.6
Epilespy	3	0.2	5	1.3	2	1.3
Gifted	8	0.6	5	1.3	--	--
Hard-of-Hearing	395	31.6	3	0.8	28	17.8
Heart Disorder	4	0.3	2	0.5	6	3.8
Learning Disabled	32	2.6	10	2.7	3	1.9
Mild/Moderate Mental Retardation	123	9.8	72	19.3	18	11.4
Orthopedically Handicapped	20	1.6	11	2.9	11	7.0
Other Health Impaired	14	1.1	12	3.2	5	3.2
Partially Sighted	7	0.6	215	57.5	21	13.4
Severe/Profound Mental Retardation	49	3.9	26	7.0	54	34.4
Speech Impaired	304	24.3	58	15.5	32	20.4
Talented	4	0.3	1	0.3	--	--

[a] Excludes 169 children who are only hearing impaired, 15 who are only visually handicapped, and 19 with both handicaps for whom data were not reported.

* Percents do not add to 100 as multiple handicaps were reported for some children.

TABLE G: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SENSORY IMPAIRED CHILDREN IN LOUISIANA BY INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN PLACEMENT, 1981-82

INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PLAN PLACEMENT	TOTAL[a]		HEARING IMPAIRED ONLY		VISUALLY HANDICAPPED ONLY		HEARING AND VISUALLY IMPAIRED	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Students	1981	100%	1420	100%	387	100%	174	100%
Self-Contained	890	45%	586	41%	245	63%	59	34%
Resource	257	13%	191	13%	63	16%	3	2%
Itinerant	83	4%	38	3%	43	11%	2	1%
Regular Only	85	4%	59	4%	25	6%	1	0.6%
Home Program	34	2%	32	2%	1	0.3%	1	0.6%
Habilitation	72	4%	39	3%	6	2%	27	15%
Special Schools	541	27%	461	33%	--	--	80	46%
No IEP on File	19	1%	14	1%	4	1%	1	0.6%

[a] Excludes 16 children who are only hearing impaired, 2 who are only visually handicapped, and 3 children with both handicaps for whom data were not reported.

TABLE H: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF TYPES OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES RECEIVED BY SENSORY IMPAIRED CHILDREN, 1981-82

EDUCATIONAL SERVICES	Hearing Impaired Only		Visually Handicapped Only		Hearing & Visually Impaired	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Students	1436	100.0%	389	100.0%	177	100.0%
Special Education Services Only	846	59%	221	57%	121	68%
Special Education -- unknown if any regular classroom instruction	25	2%	5	1%	7	4%
Regular classroom instruction only	50	3%	38	10%	1	*
Regular classroom -- unknown if any special education	7	*	--	--	--	--
Both regular classroom and special education	415	29%	120	31%	21	12%
No regular classroom instruction and no special education services	74	5%	3	*	26	15%
No special education -- unknown if regular classroom instruction	3	*	--	--	--	--
No regular classroom instruction -- unknown if special education	1	*	1	*	--	--
Unknown services	15	1%	1	*	1	*

*Less than 1%

TABLE I: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SENSORY IMPAIRED CHILDREN ENROLLED IN PARENT-CHILD PROGRAMS, 1981-82

	Hearing Impaired Only		Visually Handicapped Only		Hearing & Visually Impaired	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Students[a]	1357	100.0%	350	100.0%	163	100.0%
Enrolled in Parent-Child Program	291	21.4%	10	2.9%	14	8.6%
Not Enrolled in Parent-Child Program	1066	78.6%	340	97.1%	149	91.4%

[a] Excludes 79 children who are only hearing impaired, 39 who are only visually handicapped, and 14 who have both hearing and visual impairments for whom data were not reported.

TABLE J: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF SENSORY IMPAIRED CHILDREN RECEIVING SPEECH INSTRUCTION, 1981-82

	Hearing Impaired Only		Visually Handicapped Only		Hearing & Visually Impaired	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Students[a]	1197	100.0%	162	100.0%	134	100.0%
Receiving Training	146	12.2%	2	1.2%	13	9.7%
Not Receiving Training	1051	87.8%	160	98.8%	121	90.3%

[a] Excludes 239 children who are only hearing impaired, 227 who are only visually handicapped, and 43 children who have both hearing and visual impairments for whom data were not reported.

TABLE K: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AGE AT ONSET OF HEARING LOSS AMONG HEARING IMPAIRED CHILDREN, 1981-82

Age at Onset of Hearing Loss	Hearing Impaired Only		Hearing and Visually Impaired	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total Children[a]	1123	100.0%	157	100.0%
At Birth	690	61.4%	128	81.5%
Under 1 year	176	15.7%	11	7.0%
1 year	101	9.0%	5	3.2%
2 years	72	6.4%	7	4.5%
3 years	31	2.8%	1	0.6%
4 years	12	1.1%	1	0.6%
5 years	17	1.5%	1	0.6%
6 years	13	1.2%	--	---
7 years & over	11	1.1%	3	1.8%

[a] This excludes 313 children who are only hearing impaired and 20 who have both hearing and visual impairments for whom data were not reported.

TABLE L: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CAUSE OF HEARING LOSS AMONG HEARING IMPAIRED CHILDREN, 1981-82

Cause of Hearing Loss	Hearing Impaired Only		Hearing and Visually Impaired	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Children[a]	829	*	132	*
Causes at Birth				
Maternal Rubella	188	22.6%	51	38.6%
Trauma at Birth	30	3.6%	5	3.7%
Other Complications of Pregnancy	69	8.3%	8	6.0%
Heredity	120	14.4%	30	22.7%
Prematurity	59	7.1%	5	3.7%
Rh Incompatibility	13	1.5%	—	---
Other	--	---	--	---
Causes after Birth				
Meningitis	175	21.1	9	6.8
High Fever	79	9.5	2	1.5
Mumps	6	0.7	--	---
Infections	62	7.4	4	3.0
Measles	17	2.0	--	---
Otitis Media	30	3.6	1	0.7
Trauma after Birth	35	4.2	5	3.7
Other	120	14.4	27	20.4

[a] Excludes 607 hearing impaired children and 45 hearing and visually handicapped children for whom a cause of hearing loss was not reported or was unknown.

TABLE M: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ALL CHILDREN WITH HEARING IMPAIRMENT BY RECENCY OF AUDIOLOGICAL EXAMINATION, 1981-82

Year of AUDIOLOGICAL EXAM	Hearing Impaired Only		Hearing and Visually Impaired	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Students[a]	1300	100.0%	163	100.0%
1982	70	5.4%	3	1.8%
1981	505	38.8%	59	36.2%
1980	305	23.5%	35	21.5%
1979	263	20.2%	45	27.6%
1978	104	8.0%	14	8.6%
1977 or before	53	4.1%	7	4.2%

[a] This excludes 136 children who are only hearing impaired and 14 who have both hearing and visual impairments for whom data were not reported.

TABLE N: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN WITH A HEARING IMPAIRMENT BY DEGREE OF LOSS, 1981-82

Degree of Loss	Hearing Impaired Only		Hearing and Visually Impaired	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Students[a]	1401	100.0%	170	100.0%
Mild (less than 41 dB)	129	9.2	19	11.2
Moderate (41-55 dB)	137	9.8	13	7.6
Moderate-Severe (56-70 dB)	210	15.0	16	9.4
Severe (71-90 dB)	342	24.4	28	16.5
Profound (91 dB and above)	583	41.6	94	55.3

[a] Excludes 35 children who are only hearing impaired and 7 who have both hearing and visual handicaps for whom data were not reported.

TABLE O: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AGE AT ONSET OF VISUAL HANDICAP FOR VISUALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, 1981-82

Age at Onset of Vision Loss	Visually Handicapped Only		Hearing and Visually Impaired	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Children[a]	335	100.0%	121	100.0%
At Birth	304	90.7%	109	90.1%
Under 1 year	11	3.3%	6	5.0%
1 year	2	0.6%	--	---
2 years	2	0.6%	1	0.8%
3 years	1	0.3%	--	---
4 years	2	0.6%	--	---
5 years	4	1.2%	--	---
6 years	2	0.6%	1	0.8%
7 years & over	7	2.1%	4	3.3%

[a] Excludes 54 children who are only visually handicapped and 56 who have both hearing and visual impairments for whom data were not reported.

TABLE P: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CAUSES OF VISUAL HANDICAPS AMONG VISUALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, 1981-82

Cause of Visual Handicap	All Visually Handicapped Children	
	Number	Percentage
TOTAL[a]	468	100%
Cataracts	103	22%
Glaucoma	23	5%
Diabetes	1	0.2%
Maternal Rubella	36	8%
Retrolental Fibroplasia	33	7%
Optic Nerve Atrophy	51	11%
Albinism	42	9%
Nystagmus	87	19%
Retinitis Pigmentosa	47	10%
Macular Degeneration	10	2%
Retinal Degeneration	11	2%
Amblyopia	13	3%
Other Heredity	44	9%
Injury or Accident	12	3%
Other	82	18%

[a] This represents all students with a visual handicap but excludes 98 students for whom data were not reported.

TABLE Q: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ALL CHILDREN WITH A VISUAL IMPAIRMENT BY RECENCY OF VISUAL EXAMINATION, 1981-82

YEAR OF EXAMINATION	VISUALLY HANDICAPPED ONLY	HEARING & VISUALLY HANDICAPPED
TOTAL Students[a]	100.0%	100.0%
1982	6.5%	18.3%
1981	57.7%	41.7%
1980	22.3%	11.3%
1979	10.4%	7.0%
1978	1.5%	16.5%
1977 or before	1.5%	5.2%

[a] Excludes 53 children who are only visually handicapped, and 62 who have both hearing and visual impairments for whom data were not reported.

TABLE R: DISTRIBUTION OF DISTANCE VISION RESULTS FOR ALL CHILDREN WITH VISUAL HANDICAPS, 1981-82

LEFT EYE / RIGHT EYE	TOTAL STUDENTS	Near Normal Vision 20/10-20/60	Moderate Impairment 20/70-20/160	Severe Impairment 20/200-20/400	Profound Impairment 20/500-20/1000	Data Not Reported
TOTAL STUDENTS	566	60	66	116	113	211
Near Normal Vision 20/10-20/60	56	39	5	6	4	2
Moderate Impairment 20/70-20/160	68	8	49	6	4	1
Severe Impairment 20/200-20/400	119	2	10	88	14	5
Profound Impairment 20/500-20/1000	118	8	1	16	87	6
Data not reported	205	3	1	--	4	197

TABLE 5: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF FIELD OF VISION RESULTS FOR VISUALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, 1981-82

FIELD OF VISION	VISUALLY HANDICAPPED ONLY		HEARING & VISUALLY HANDICAPPED	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL Students[a]	193	100%	41	100%
Normal both eyes	47	24%	2	5%
Restricted both eyes	122	63%	29	71%
One eye restricted, other eye normal	13	7%	6	15%
One eye restricted, other eye unknown status	7	4%	3	7%
One eye normal, other eye unknown status	4	2%	1	2%

[a] Excludes 196 students with only a visual handicap and 136 students with both hearing and visual impairments for whom data were not reported.

TABLE T: NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF READING MODES OF VISUALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, 1981-82

READING MODES	VISUALLY HANDICAPPED ONLY		HEARING & VISUALLY HANDICAPPED	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TOTAL CHILDREN[a]	323	*	91	*
Braille	68	21%	3	3%
Large Print	214	66%	15	16%
Recorded Materials	56	17%	2	2%
Regular	93	29%	82	90%
Other	9	3%	1	1%

[a] Excludes 47 children for whom this item was left blank and 105 who were non-readers.

* Percents do not add to 100 as multiple modes were reported for some children.

TABLE U: PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF LOW VISION EXAMINATIONS FOR VISUALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN, 1981-82

LOW-VISION EXAMINATION	VISUALLY HANDICAPPED ONLY	HEARING & VISUALLY HANDICAPPED
TOTAL Students[a]	100.0%	100.0%
Not Tested	63.7%	38.9%
Tested	36.3%	61.1%
TOTAL TESTED	100.0%	100.0%
Aids Prescribed	58.6%	44.9%
Not Prescribed	31.3%	49.2%
Information Not Reported	10.2%	5.8%

[a] Excludes 36 students who have only visual handicaps and 64 students who are deaf-blind for whom data were not reported.